

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

AUBREY JOVAN DEVELL TAYLOR,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) No. 2:15-cv-2791-JDT-cgc
)
STANLEY DICKERSON, et.al.,)
)
)
Defendants.)

ORDER TO MODIFY DOCKET,
DISMISSING COMPLAINT AND GRANTING LEAVE TO AMEND

On November 25, 2015, Plaintiff Aubrey Jovan Devell Taylor (“Taylor”), who is confined as an inmate of Northeast Correctional Complex (“NECX”), in Mountain City, Tennessee, filed a *pro se* complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 accompanied by a motion asking leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* for actions that occurred at the West Tennessee State Penitentiary (“WTSP”) in Henning, Tennessee. (ECF Nos. 1 & 2). On December 8, 2015, United States District Judge Aleta A. Trauger for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and assessed the civil filing fee pursuant to the Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(a)-(b) as well as transferred this matter to the United States District Court of the Western District of Tennessee, Western Division at Memphis, Tennessee. (ECF No. 4.) The Clerk shall record the defendants as WTSP Former Warden Stanley Dickerson, WTSP Former Warden James Holloway, Tennessee Department of Correction (“TDOC”) Commissioner Derrick Schofield, TDOC, WTSP Unit Manager First Name Unknown (“FNU”) Bryant, Corporal (“Cpl.”) FNU Chritton, Sergeant (“Sgt.”) FNU

Henning, IRC FNU Reese, Cpl. FNU Massey, Cpl. FNU Moffat, C.O. FNU Avery, C.O. FNU Deberry, Cpl. FNU Bartley, Cpl. FNU Rayburn.¹ On December 23, 2015, Taylor included a demand for trial by jury. (ECF No. 8.)

I. THE COMPLAINT

Taylor alleges that on March 20, 2015, officers in the strike team were sent by the commissioner to search and seize Unit 3 at WTSP. (Compl. at 24, ECF No. 1, Grievance No. 487671.) When Defendant Chritton as well as another unnamed officer entered Taylor's cell to conduct a strip search, Taylor informed them he was cooperating, which, he contends, he did because he already witnessed them assault over half the upper level. (*Id.*) Taylor alleges that Defendant Chritton stated, "It don't matter we still going to take you down, cuz . . ." and "you blacks don't know how to act." (*Id.*) While Taylor was taking off his clothes, Defendant Chritton squared off against him in a fighting stance. (*Id.*) When Taylor turned to squat and cough, he alleges "they" attacked him, telling him not to resist, twisted his wrist, pulled his hair, cuffed him, and then dragged him from his cell and threw him into the shower. (*Id.*) At that time, "the officer" entered the shower and "smashed [his] face into the concrete wall twice which resulted in [his] having a tooth knocked out of [his] mouth." (*Id.*)

While Taylor was dazed and locked in the shower, he looked out of window and saw Defendant Dickerson, to whom he explained that he was assaulted for no reason, that he was bleeding, and that he needed medical attention. (*Id.*) Another officer then came in and put yellow paper over the shower window. (*Id.*) When the entire lower level was searched, Taylor was removed from the shower and taken to his cell. (*Id.*) Defendant Chritton was at Taylor's cell and smiled and winked at Taylor. (*Id.*) Taylor waited for them to leave, and then explained

¹The Clerk is DIRECTED to modify the docket to add first names, which were unknown in the complaint, but found pursuant to this order.

to Defendant Bartley what happened and asked for medical attention because Taylor had a broken tooth which was shoved into the roof of his mouth and would not stop bleeding. (*Id.*) Ten minutes later, Taylor was taken to the infirmary where he was told by the dentist that he might have root damage and that Taylor should see him the following Monday for possible partial dentures. (*Id.*) As of March 21, 2015, Taylor has been requesting that the proper procedure be done because he is the victim of police brutality and a hate crime. (*Id.*)

Taylor lists additional allegations against the individual defendants. Defendants Dickerson and Holloway were informed of the assault and refused to protect inmates including Taylor. (*Id.* at 8.) Defendant Schofield sent the strikeforce to search and seize the compound, and is responsible for any injuries caused during that process. (*Id.*) Defendant Bryant was informed of the assault, oversaw the attacks in progress, and refused to provide medical attention or inform proper medical personnel. (*Id.*) Defendants Henning, Massey, Moffat, and Avery were present and aware of the assault, but refused to protect inmates. (*Id.* at 8 & 9.) Defendant Reese was present and aware of the assault, but refused to protect inmates, including Taylor, stating, “the sert team is the Commissioner’s boys they are governed by no rules and is allowed to do as fit.” (*Id.* at 9.) Defendant Deberry was present and aware of the assault, but failed to protect as well as violated Taylor’s rights on May 6, 2015, when he locked Taylor in his cell after speaking with Defendant Chritton. (*Id.*) Defendant Rayburn constantly came to Taylor’s cell taunting Taylor, using racial slurs, and informing Taylor that he should not write grievances or someone may finish the job. (*Id.*) TDOC refused to protect Taylor. (*Id.* at 9 & 10.) Taylor also alleges that due to his head injury, he now hears beeps frequently causing mood to changes; something that has not been present for the last ten or eleven years. (*Id.* at 10.)

Taylor seeks monetary compensation from all defendants as well as the demotion of Defendant Dickerson. (*Id.* at 11-12.) Taylor also entered a demand for a jury trial on December 23, 2015. (ECF No. 8.)

II. ANALYSIS

A. Screening and Standard

The Court is required to screen prisoner complaints and to dismiss any complaint, or any portion thereof, if the complaint—

- (1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or
- (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

In assessing whether the complaint in this case states a claim on which relief may be granted, the standards under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), as stated in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677-79 (2009), and in *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555-57 (2007), are applied. *Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470-71 (6th Cir. 2010). “Accepting all well-pleaded allegations in the complaint as true, the Court ‘consider[s] the factual allegations in [the] complaint to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief.’” *Williams v. Curtin*, 631 F.3d 380, 383 (6th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 681) (alteration in original). “[P]leadings that . . . are no more than conclusions . . . are not entitled to the assumption of truth. While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679; see also *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 n.3 (“Rule 8(a)(2) still requires a ‘showing,’ rather than a blanket assertion, of entitlement to relief. Without some factual allegation in the complaint, it is hard to see how a claimant could satisfy the requirement

of providing not only ‘fair notice’ of the nature of the claim, but also ‘grounds’ on which the claim rests.”).

“A complaint can be frivolous either factually or legally. Any complaint that is legally frivolous would *ipso facto* fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.” *Hill*, 630 F.3d at 470 (citing *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 328-29 (1989)).

Whether a complaint is factually frivolous under §§ 1915A(b)(1) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) is a separate issue from whether it fails to state a claim for relief. Statutes allowing a complaint to be dismissed as frivolous give “judges not only the authority to dismiss a claim based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also the unusual power to pierce the veil of the complaint’s factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless.” *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327, 109 S. Ct. 1827 (interpreting 28 U.S.C. § 1915). Unlike a dismissal for failure to state a claim, where a judge must accept all factual allegations as true, *Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. at 1949-50, a judge does not have to accept “fantastic or delusional” factual allegations as true in prisoner complaints that are reviewed for frivolousness. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327-28, 109 S. Ct. 1827.

Id. at 471.

“*Pro se* complaints are to be held ‘to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers,’ and should therefore be liberally construed.” *Williams*, 631 F.3d at 383 (quoting *Martin v. Overton*, 391 F.3d 710, 712 (6th Cir. 2004)). *Pro se* litigants and prisoners are not exempt from the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. As the Sixth Circuit has explained:

Before the recent onslaught of *pro se* prisoner suits, the Supreme Court suggested that *pro se* complaints are to be held to a less stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. See *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972) (per curiam). Neither that Court nor other courts, however, have been willing to abrogate basic pleading essentials in *pro se* suits. See, e.g., *id.* at 521 (holding petitioner to standards of *Conley v. Gibson*); *Merritt v. Faulkner*, 697 F.2d 761 (7th Cir.) (duty to be less stringent with *pro se* complaint does not require court to conjure up unplead allegations), *cert. denied*, 464 U.S. 986 (1983); *McDonald v. Hall*, 610 F.2d 16 (1st Cir. 1979) (same); *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237 (D.D.C. 1987) (*pro se* plaintiffs should plead with requisite specificity so as to give defendants notice); *Holsey v. Collins*, 90 F.R.D. 122 (D. Md. 1981) (even *pro se* litigants must meet some minimum standards).

Wells v. Brown, 891 F.2d 591, 594 (6th Cir. 1989); see also *Brown v. Matauszak*, No. 09-2259, 2011 WL 285251, at *5 (6th Cir. Jan. 31, 2011) (affirming dismissal of *pro se* complaint for

failure to comply with “unique pleading requirements” and stating “a court cannot ‘create a claim which [a plaintiff] has not spelled out in his pleading’”) (quoting *Clark v. Nat'l Travelers Life Ins. Co.*, 518 F.2d 1167, 1169 (6th Cir. 1975)) (alteration in original); *Payne v. Sec'y of Treas.*, 73 F. App'x 836, 837 (6th Cir. 2003) (affirming *sua sponte* dismissal of complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) and stating, “[n]either this court nor the district court is required to create Payne’s claim for her”); *cf. Pliler v. Ford*, 542 U.S. 225, 231 (2004) (“District judges have no obligation to act as counsel or paralegal to *pro se* litigants.”); *Young Bok Song v. Gipson*, 423 F. App'x 506, 510 (6th Cir. 2011) (“[W]e decline to affirmatively require courts to ferret out the strongest cause of action on behalf of *pro se* litigants. Not only would that duty be overly burdensome, it would transform the courts from neutral arbiters of disputes into advocates for a particular party. While courts are properly charged with protecting the rights of all who come before it, that responsibility does not encompass advising litigants as to what legal theories they should pursue.”).

B. § 1983 Claim

Taylor filed his complaint on the court-supplied form for actions under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Section 1983 provides:

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two elements: (1) a deprivation of rights secured by the “Constitution and laws” of the United States (2) committed by a defendant acting under color of state law. *Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144, 150 (1970).

1. *Claims against TDOC*

The Court construes claims against TDOC as claims against the State of Tennessee. Plaintiff cannot sue the State of Tennessee under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that “[t]he Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.” U.S. Const. amend. XI. The Eleventh Amendment has been construed to prohibit citizens from suing their own states in federal court. *Welch v. Tex. Dep’t of Highways & Pub. Transp.*, 483 U.S. 468, 472 (1987); *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984); *Employees of Dep’t of Pub. Health & Welfare v. Mo. Dep’t of Pub. Health & Welfare*, 411 U.S. 279, 280 (1973); *see also Va. Office for Protection & Advocacy v. Stewart*, 131 S. Ct. 1632, 1638 (2011) (“A State may waive its sovereign immunity at its pleasure, and in some circumstances Congress may abrogate it by appropriate legislation. But absent waiver or valid abrogation, federal courts may not entertain a private person’s suit against a State.” (citations omitted)). By its terms, the Eleventh Amendment bars all suits, regardless of the relief sought. *Pennhurst*, 465 U.S. at 100-01. Tennessee has not waived its sovereign immunity. Tenn. Code Ann. § 20-13-102(a). Moreover, a state is not a person within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Lapides v. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. Sys. of Ga.*, 535 U.S. 613, 617 (2002); *Will v. Mich. Dep’t of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 71 (1989).

2. *Eighth Amendment Claims: Assault, Failure to Protect and Medical Indifference
Verbal Assault*

Taylor’s allegations that he was assaulted by an officer, that Defendants failed to protect him from the assault, that Defendants failed to provide medical care, and that Defendant Rayburn taunted and harassed him all arise under the Eighth Amendment, which prohibits cruel and unusual punishments. *See generally Wilson v. Seiter*, 501 U.S. 294 (1991). Where an inmate challenges a use of force by prison guards, “the question whether the measure taken inflicted unnecessary and wanton pain and suffering ultimately turns on whether force was applied in a good faith effort to maintain or restore discipline or maliciously and sadistically for the very purpose of causing harm.” *Id.* at 320-21 (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also Wilkins v. Gaddy*, 559 U.S. 34, 37 (2010) (per curiam) (“The ‘core judicial inquiry’ [for an excessive force claim] was not whether a certain quantum of injury was sustained, but rather whether force was applied in a good-faith effort to restore discipline, or maliciously and sadistically to cause harm.” (internal quotation marks omitted)). A significant physical injury is not required to establish the objective component of an Eighth Amendment claim. *Wilkins*, 559 U.S. at 1178-79 (“An inmate who is gratuitously beaten by guards does not lose his ability to pursue an excessive force claim merely because he has the good fortune to escape without serious injury.”); *Hudson v. McMillian*, 503 U.S. 1, 7-9 (1992) (same).

An Eighth Amendment claim consists of both objective and subjective components. *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 834 (1994); *Hudson v. McMillian*, 503 U.S. 1, 8 (1992); *Wilson*, 501 U.S. at 298; *Williams v. Curtin*, 633 F.3d at 383; *Mingus v. Butler*, 591 F.3d 474, 479-80 (6th Cir. 2010). The objective component requires that the deprivation be “sufficiently serious.” *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834; *Hudson*, 503 U.S. at 8; *Wilson*, 501 U.S. at 298. To satisfy

the objective component of an Eighth Amendment claim, a prisoner must show that he “is incarcerated under conditions posing a substantial risk of serious harm,” *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834; *see also Miller v. Calhoun Cnty.*, 408 F.3d 803, 812 (6th Cir. 2005), or that he has been deprived of the “minimal civilized measure of life’s necessities,” *Wilson*, 501 U.S. at 298 (quoting *Rhodes v. Chapman*, 452 U.S. 337, 347 (1981)); *see also Hadix v. Johnson*, 367 F.3d 513, 525 (6th Cir. 2004). “The Supreme Court has held that ‘prison officials have a duty . . . to protect prisoners from violence at the hands of other prisoners.’” *Bishop v. Hackel*, 636 F.3d 757, 766 (6th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834).

To establish the subjective component of an Eighth Amendment violation, a prisoner must demonstrate that the official acted with the requisite intent, that is, that he had a “sufficiently culpable state of mind.” *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834; *see also Wilson*, 501 U.S. at 297, 302-03. The plaintiff must show that the prison officials acted with “deliberate indifference” to a substantial risk that the prisoner would suffer serious harm. *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834; *Wilson*, 501 U.S. at 303; *Helling v. McKinney*, 509 U.S. at 32; *Woods v. Lecureux*, 110 F.3d 1215, 1222 (6th Cir. 1997); *Street*, 102 F.3d at 814; *Taylor v. Mich. Dep’t of Corr.*, 69 F.3d 76, 79 (6th Cir. 1995). “[D]eliberate indifference describes a state of mind more blameworthy than negligence.” *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 835. Thus,

[a] prison official cannot be found liable under the Eighth Amendment for denying an inmate humane conditions of confinement unless the official knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety; the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference. This approach comports best with the text of the Eighth Amendment as our cases have interpreted it. The Eighth Amendment does not outlaw cruel and unusual “conditions”; it outlaws cruel and unusual “punishments.” An act or omission unaccompanied by knowledge of a significant risk of harm might well be something society wishes to discourage, and if harm does result society might well wish to assure compensation. The common law reflects such concerns when it imposes tort liability on a purely objective basis. . . . But an official’s failure to

alleviate a significant risk that he should have perceived but did not, while no cause for commendation, cannot under our cases be condemned as the infliction of punishment.

Id. at 837-38 (emphasis added; citations omitted); *see also Garretson v. City of Madison Heights*, 407 F.3d 789, 796 (6th Cir. 2005) (“If the officers failed to act in the face of an obvious risk of which they should have known but did not, then they did not violate the Fourteenth Amendment.”). The subjective component must be evaluated for each defendant individually. *Bishop*, 636 F.3d at 767; *see also id.* at 768 (“[W]e must focus on whether each individual Deputy had the personal involvement necessary to permit a finding of subjective knowledge.”).

Taylor alleges that an unnamed officer and Defendant Chritton “attacked” him by twisting his wrists, pulling his hair, cuffing him and throwing him into the shower. (Compl. at 24, ECF No. 1.) These allegations do not rise to the level of excessive force. However, after being thrown in the shower while handcuffed, “the officer” smashed Taylor’s face into the concrete wall twice resulting in having a tooth knocked out. (*Id.*) Because Taylor fails to name the individual committing the act, the subjective component to an unnamed individual cannot be met even if the actions themselves may rise to the level of an Eighth Amendment violation.

Taylor conclusory allegations that Defendants were aware of the assault and failed to protect him do not rise to the level of an Eighth Amendment violation. The assault occurred inside a shower with no mention of any named defendant being present. While Defendant Schofield may have ordered the search and seizure, there is nothing to conclude that he had any knowledge of the alleged assault in the shower. Any conclusory allegations that Defendants knew and failed to act are insufficient to establish such knowledge.

Additionally, Defendants Dickerson, Holloway, and Schofield appear to be sued as supervisors. Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, “[g]overnment officials may not be held liable for the

unconstitutional conduct of their subordinates under a theory of *respondeat superior*.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 676; *see also Bellamy v. Bradley*, 729 F.2d 416, 421 (6th Cir. 1984). Thus, “a plaintiff must plead that each Government-official defendant, through the official’s own official actions, violated the Constitution.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 676.

There must be a showing that the supervisor encouraged the specific instance of misconduct or in some other way directly participated in it. At a minimum, a § 1983 plaintiff must show that a supervisory official at least implicitly authorized, approved or knowingly acquiesced in the unconstitutional conduct of the offending subordinates.

Bellamy, 729 F.2d at 421 (citation omitted). A supervisory official who is aware of the unconstitutional conduct of his subordinates, but fails to act, generally cannot be held liable in his individual capacity. *Grinter v. Knight*, 532 F.3d 567, 575-76 (6th Cir. 2008); *Gregory v. City of Louisville*, 444 F.3d 725, 751 (6th Cir. 2006); *Shehee v. Luttrell*, 199 F.3d 295, 300 (6th Cir. 1999); *Lillard v. Shelby Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, 76 F.3d 716, 727-28 (6th Cir. 1996). The complaint does not allege that Defendants Dickerson, Holloway, and Schofield, through their own actions, violated Plaintiff’s rights.

The Eighth Amendment also applies to Taylor’s claims of medical indifference. Under *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976), “deliberate indifference to serious medical needs of prisoners constitutes the ‘unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain,’ . . . proscribed by the Eighth Amendment.” However, not “every claim by a prisoner that he has not received adequate medical treatment states a violation of the Eighth Amendment.” *Estelle*, 429 U.S. at 105. “In order to state a cognizable claim, a prisoner must allege acts or omissions sufficiently harmful to evidence deliberate indifference to serious medical needs. It is only such indifference that can offend ‘evolving standards of decency’ in violation of the Eighth Amendment.” *Id.* at 106.

Within the context of *Estelle* claims, the objective component requires that the medical need be sufficiently serious. *Hunt v. Reynolds*, 974 F.2d 734, 735 (6th Cir. 1992). “A medical

need is serious if it is one that has been diagnosed by a physician as mandating treatment or one that is so obvious that even a lay person would easily recognize the necessity for a doctor's attention." *Ramos v. Lamm*, 639 F.2d 559, 575 (10th Cir. 1980) (quoting *Laaman v. Helgemo*e, 437 F. Supp. 269, 311 (D.N.H. 1977)).

To make out a claim of an Eighth Amendment *Estelle* violation, a prisoner must plead facts showing that "prison authorities have denied reasonable requests for medical treatment in the face of an obvious need for such attention where the inmate is thereby exposed to undue suffering or the threat of tangible residual injury." *Westlake v. Lucas*, 537 F.2d 857, 860 (6th Cir. 1976). The Court clarified the meaning of deliberate indifference in *Farmer v. Brennan*, as the reckless disregard of a substantial risk of serious harm; mere negligence will not suffice. *Id.* 511 U.S. at 835-36.

There are no allegations that any of the named Defendants were aware of the severity of Taylor's injury yet disregarded that serious medical need. In fact, Taylor alleges that ten minutes after communicating his need for medical attention to Defendant Bartley, he was seen by medical staff. (Compl. at 24, ECF No. 1.) Although Taylor complains that he has not been given further medical care, Taylor does not allege that any of the named Defendants had anything to do with the lack of medical care in the days following the attack, and he has sued none of the medical personnel. Thus, Taylor has not sufficiently stated a claim that the Defendants were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs.

Lastly, Claims against Defendant Rayburn for taunting and racial slurs are construed as claims for verbal abuse and such comments do not satisfy the objective component of an Eighth Amendment claim. *See, e.g., Pasley v. Conerly*, 345 F. App'x 981, 984 (6th Cir. 2009); *Jones Bey v. Johnson*, 248 F. App'x 675, 677-78 (6th Cir. 2007) (no Eighth Amendment claim for

prison guard’s “use of racial slurs and other derogatory language”); *Miller v. Wertanen*, 109 F. App’x 64, 65 (6th Cir. 2004) (a guard’s verbal threat to sexually assault an inmate “was not punishment that violated [the prisoner’s] constitutional rights”); *Johnson v. Unknown Dellatif*, 357 F.3d 539, 546 (6th Cir. 2004) (“harassment and verbal abuse . . . do not constitute the type of infliction of pain that the Eighth Amendment prohibits”); *Johnson v. Moore*, 7 F. App’x 382, 384 (6th Cir. 2001) (“Allegations of verbal harassment and verbal abuse by prison officials toward an inmate do not constitute punishment within the meaning of the Eighth Amendment. Nor do allegations of verbal harassment rise to the level of unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain proscribed by the Eighth Amendment.” (citation omitted)); *Owens v. Johnson*, No. 99-2094, 2000 WL 876766, at *2 (6th Cir. June 23, 2000) (“The occasional or sporadic use of racial slurs, although unprofessional and reprehensible, does not rise to a level of constitutional magnitude. The petty exchanges of insults between a prisoner and guard do not amount to constitutional torts.” (citation omitted)); *Ivey v. Wilson*, 832 F.2d 950, 955 (6th Cir. 1987) (per curiam) (holding that verbal abuse or harassment does not constitute punishment under the Eighth Amendment); *Miles v. Tchrozynski*, No. 2:09-CV-11192, 2009 WL 960510, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Apr. 7, 2009) (“Even verbal threats by a corrections officer to assault an inmate do not violate an inmate’s Eighth Amendment rights. Verbal threats and abuse made in retaliation for filing grievances are likewise not actionable.” (citation omitted)). Thus, Taylor has no cause of action for taunting or slurs made by Defendant Rayburn.

III. LEAVE TO AMEND

The Sixth Circuit has held that a district court may allow a prisoner to amend his complaint to avoid a *sua sponte* dismissal under the PLRA. *LaFountain v. Harry*, 716 F.3d 944, 951 (6th Cir. 2013); *see also Brown v. R.I.*, No. 12-1403, 2013 WL 646489, at *1 (1st Cir. Feb.

22, 2013) (per curiam) (“Ordinarily, before dismissal for failure to state a claim is ordered, some form of notice and an opportunity to cure the deficiencies in the complaint must be afforded.”). Leave to amend is not required where a deficiency cannot be cured. *Brown*, 2013 WL 646489, at *1; *Gonzalez-Gonzalez v. United States*, 257 F.3d 31, 37 (1st Cir. 2001) (“This does not mean, of course, that every *sua sponte* dismissal entered without prior notice to the plaintiff automatically must be reversed. If it is crystal clear that the plaintiff cannot prevail and that amending the complaint would be futile, then a *sua sponte* dismissal may stand.”); *Grayson v. Mayview State Hosp.*, 293 F.3d 103, 114 (3d Cir. 2002) (“*in forma pauperis* plaintiffs who file complaints subject to dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) should receive leave to amend unless amendment would be inequitable or futile”); *Curley v. Perry*, 246 F.3d 1278, 1284 (10th Cir. 2001) (“We agree with the majority view that sua sponte dismissal of a meritless complaint that cannot be salvaged by amendment comports with due process and does not infringe the right of access to the courts.”).

IV. CONCLUSION

The Court DISMISSES the complaint for failure to state a claim on which relief can be granted, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and 1915A(b)(1). However, the court cannot conclude that any amendment to Taylor’s claims would be futile as a matter of law. Therefore, Taylor is GRANTED leave to amend his complaint. Any amendment must be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of entry of this order. Taylor is advised that an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint and must be complete in itself without reference to the prior pleadings. The text of the complaint must allege sufficient facts to support each claim without reference to any extraneous document. Any exhibits must be identified by number in the text of the amended complaint and must be attached to the complaint. All claims alleged in an amended complaint must arise from the facts alleged in the original complaint or the first amended

complaint. Taylor may add additional defendants provided that the claims against the new parties arise from the acts and omissions set forth in the original or first amended complaints. Each claim for relief must be stated in a separate count and must identify each defendant sued in that count. If Taylor fails to file an amended complaint within the time specified, the Court will assess a strike pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and enter judgment.

Taylor shall promptly notify the Clerk in writing of any change of address or extended absence. Failure to comply with these requirements, or any other order of the Court, may result in the dismissal of this case without further notice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/James D. Todd
JAMES D. TODD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE